

IN THE DRAWINGS

Applicant herein submits a proposed corrected Figure 1. The only change in the new Figure 1 is to switch 116, which is now illustrated in a more conventional fashion as a single pole, six throw switch. This proposed drawing change and the reasons for it are discussed below in the Remarks section of this response.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's approval of this proposed drawing change. Upon receipt of a notice of allowance, Applicant will submit corrected formal drawings in accordance with the proposed change.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks responsive to the Office Action dated August 23, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this application.

Claims 1-19 were pending in this application. Applicant has herein amended claims 1, 6, 13, 15, 16, 17, and 19 and canceled claims 4, 5, 12, and 18. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 6-11, 13-17, and 19 are now pending in this case.

Applicant respectfully thanks the Office for the indication that claims 12 and 13 are merely objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In the first Office Action, the Office rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Particularly, the Office asserted is that it is not clear what is meant by "a single pole six throw switch". Applicant respectfully traverses. The terminology "single pole six throw switch" is well understood in the art. Particularly, it refers to a switch having a single switchable contact (the "pole") that is switchable between six contact positions (the "throws"). Since the terminology is quite clear, Applicant assumes that the confusion is a result of the poorly drawn switch in Figure 1. In order to improve the clarity of the application, Applicant herein submits a proposed revised Figure 1 in which the single pole, six throw switch 116 is drawn in a more conventional fashion. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's approval of the proposed drawing change. Upon receipt of a notice of allowance, Applicant will submit corrected formal drawings.

The Office also rejected claims 1-5, 14, 15, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shapiro. The Office further rejected claims 6-8, 10, 11, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro.

As previously noted, the Office indicated that claims 12 and 13 patentably distinguished over the prior art.

In order to place this application in condition for allowance, Applicant has amended claim 1, without prejudice to continuing prosecution of original claim 1


in this or a related application, to include the limitations of claim 12, including the limitations of intervening claims 4 and 5. Applicant has canceled claims 4, 5, and 12. Accordingly, claim 1 is now patentable in accordance with the Office Action. Claims 2, 3, 6-11, and a 13-16 depend from newly amended claim 1 and, therefore, distinguish over the prior art for at least all of the same reasons as claim 1.

Applicant also has herein amended independent claims 17 and 19 so as to incorporate the same or similar limitations as former claim 12. Accordingly, claims 17 and 19 should also now be in allowable form in accordance with the Office Action of August 23, 2005.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to issue a Notice of Allowance at the earliest possible date. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned counsel by telephone call in order to further the prosecution of this case in any way.

Respectfully submitted,

November 23, 2005
Dated


Theodore Naccarella
Reg. No. 33,023

Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP
1101 Market Street, Suite 2600
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950
Telephone: (215) 923-4466
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189

TXN:pmf